

Realization of the $1 \rightarrow 3$ optimal phase-covariant quantum cloning machine

Fabio Sciarrino and Francesco De Martini

Dipartimento di Fisica and

Istituto Nazionale per la Fisica della Materia

Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Roma, 00185 - Italy

Abstract

The $1 \rightarrow 3$ quantum phase covariant cloning, which optimally clones qubits belonging to the equatorial plane of the Bloch sphere, achieves the fidelity $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow 3} = 0.833$, larger than for the $1 \rightarrow 3$ universal cloning $\mathcal{F}_{univ}^{1 \rightarrow 3} = 0.778$. We show how the $1 \rightarrow 3$ phase covariant cloning can be implemented by a smart modification of the standard *universal* quantum machine by a projection of the output states over the symmetric subspace. A complete experimental realization of the protocol for polarization encoded qubits based on non-linear and linear methods will be discussed.

In the last years a great deal of efforts has been devoted to the realization of the optimal approximations to the quantum cloning and flipping operations over an unknown qubit $|\phi\rangle$. Even if these two processes are unrealizable in their exact forms [1], [2], they can be optimally approximated by the corresponding universal machines, i.e., by the universal quantum cloning machine (UQCM) and the universal-NOT (U-NOT) gate [3]. The optimal quantum cloning machine has been experimentally realized following several approaches, i.e. by exploiting the process of stimulated emission in a quantum-injected optical parametric amplifier (QI-OPA) [4–7], by a quantum network [8] and by acting with projective operators over the symmetric subspaces of many qubits [9,10]. The $N \rightarrow M$ UQCM transforms N input qubits in the state $|\phi\rangle$ into M entangled output qubits in the mixed state ρ_{out} . The quality of the resulting copies is quantified by the fidelity parameter $\mathcal{F}_{univ}^{N \rightarrow M} = \langle \phi | \rho_{out} | \phi \rangle = \frac{N+1+\beta}{N+2}$ with $\beta = \frac{N}{M} \leq 1$.

Not only the perfect cloning of unknown qubit is forbidden but also perfect cloning of subsets containing non orthogonal states. This no-go theorem ensures the security of cryptographic protocols as BB84 [11]. Recently *state dependent* cloning machines have been investigated that are optimal respect to a given ensemble [12]. The partial a-priori knowledge of the state allows to reach a higher fidelity than for the universal cloning. In particular the $N \rightarrow M$ *phase-covariant quantum cloning machine* (PQCM) considers the cloning of N into M output qubits, where the input ones belong to the equatorial plane of the corresponding Poincare' sphere, i.e. expressed by: $|\phi\rangle = 2^{-1/2} (|0\rangle + e^{i\phi} |1\rangle)$. The values of the optimal fidelities $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{N \rightarrow M}$ for this machine have been found [13]. In the present article we will restrict ourselves to the case in which $N = 1$. For M assuming odd values it is found $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow M} = \frac{1}{4} (3 + M^{-1})$ while in the case of even M -values $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow M} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 + 2M^{-1}})$. In particular we have $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow 2} = 0.854$ to be compared with $\mathcal{F}_{univ}^{1 \rightarrow 2} = 0.833$ and $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow 3} = 0.833$ with: $\mathcal{F}_{univ}^{1 \rightarrow 3} = 0.778$.

It is worthwhile to enlighten the connections existing between the cloning processes and the theory of quantum measurement [14]. The concept of universal quantum cloning is indeed related to the problem of optimal quantum state estimation [15] since for $M \rightarrow \infty$,

$\mathcal{F}_{univ}^{N \rightarrow M} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{estim}^N = \frac{N+1}{N+2}$ where $\mathcal{F}_{estim}^N$ is the optimal fidelity for the state estimation of any ensemble of N unknown, identically prepared qubits. Likewise, the phase-covariant cloning has a connection with the estimation of an equatorial qubit, that is, with the problem of finding the optimal strategy to estimate the value of the phase ϕ [16], [17]. Precisely, the optimal strategy consists of a POVM corresponding to a Von Neumann measurement of N input qubits characterized by a set of $N + 1$ orthogonal projectors and achieves the fidelity $\mathcal{F}_{phase}^N$ [17]. In general for $M \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{N \rightarrow M} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{phase}^N$. For $N = 1$ is found: $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow M} = \mathcal{F}_{phase}^1 + \frac{1}{4M}$ with $\mathcal{F}_{phase}^1 = 3/4$.

To our knowledge, no PQCM device has been implemented experimentally in the domain of Quantum Optics [18,19]. In the present work we report the implementation of a $1 \rightarrow 3$ PQCM by adopting a modified standard $1 \rightarrow 2$ UQCM and by further projecting the output qubits over the symmetric subspace [5,9]. Let the state of the input qubit be expressed by: $|\phi\rangle_S = \alpha|0\rangle_S + \beta|1\rangle_S$ with *real* parameters α and β and $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$. The output state of the $1 \rightarrow 2$ UQCM device reads:

$$|\Sigma\rangle_{SAB} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} |\phi\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A |\phi^\perp\rangle_B - \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|\phi\rangle_S |\phi^\perp\rangle_A + |\phi^\perp\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A) |\phi\rangle_B \quad (1)$$

The qubits S and A are the optimal cloned qubits while the qubit B is the optimally flipped one. We perform the operation $U_B = \sigma_Y$ on the qubit B . This local flipping transformation of $|\phi\rangle_B$ leads to: $|\Upsilon\rangle_{SAB} = (\mathbb{I}_S \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \otimes U_B) |\Sigma\rangle_{SAB} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} |\phi\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A |\phi\rangle_B - \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|\phi\rangle_S |\phi^\perp\rangle_A + |\phi^\perp\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A) |\phi^\perp\rangle_B$. By this non-universal cloning process three *asymmetric* copies have been obtained: two clones (qubits S and A) with fidelity $5/6$, and a third one (qubit B) with fidelity $2/3$. We may now project S , A and B over the symmetric subspace and obtain three symmetric clones with a higher average fidelity. The symmetrization operator Π_{sym}^{SAB} reads as $\Pi_{sym}^{SAB} = |\Pi_1\rangle\langle\Pi_1| + |\Pi_2\rangle\langle\Pi_2| + |\Pi_3\rangle\langle\Pi_3| + |\Pi_4\rangle\langle\Pi_4|$ where $|\Pi_1\rangle = |\phi\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A |\phi\rangle_B$, $|\Pi_2\rangle = |\phi^\perp\rangle_S |\phi^\perp\rangle_A |\phi^\perp\rangle_B$, $|\Pi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|\phi\rangle_S |\phi^\perp\rangle_A |\phi^\perp\rangle_B + |\phi^\perp\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A |\phi^\perp\rangle_B + |\phi^\perp\rangle_S |\phi^\perp\rangle_A |\phi\rangle_B)$ and $|\Pi_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|\phi\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A |\phi^\perp\rangle_B + |\phi^\perp\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A |\phi\rangle_B + |\phi\rangle_S |\phi^\perp\rangle_B |\phi\rangle_A)$. The symmetric subspace has dimension 4 since three qubits are involved. The probability of success of the

projection is equal to $\frac{8}{9}$. The normalized output state $|\xi\rangle_{SAB} = \Pi_{sym}^{SAB} |\Upsilon\rangle_{SAB}$ is

$$|\xi\rangle_{SAB} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} |\phi\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A |\phi\rangle_B - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (|\phi\rangle_S |\phi^\perp\rangle_A |\phi^\perp\rangle_B + |\phi^\perp\rangle_S |\phi\rangle_A |\phi^\perp\rangle_B + |\phi^\perp\rangle_S |\phi^\perp\rangle_A |\phi\rangle_B) \quad (2)$$

Let us now estimate the output density matrices of the qubits S , A and B

$$\rho_S = \rho_A = \rho_B = \frac{5}{6} |\phi\rangle \langle \phi| + \frac{1}{6} |\phi^\perp\rangle \langle \phi^\perp| \quad (3)$$

This leads to the fidelity $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow 3} = 5/6$ equal to the optimal one [12,13].

By applying a different unitary operator U_B to the qubit B we can implement the phase-covariant cloning for different equatorial planes. Interestingly, note that by this symmetrization technique a depolarizing channel $E_{dep}(\rho) = \frac{1}{4} (\rho + \sigma_X \rho \sigma_X + \sigma_Y \rho \sigma_Y + \sigma_Z \rho \sigma_Z)$ on channel B transforms immediately the non-universal phase covariant cloning into the *universal* $1 \rightarrow 3$ UQCM with the overall fidelity $\mathcal{F}_{univ}^{1 \rightarrow 3} = 7/9$. This represent a relevant new proposal to be implemented within the $1 \rightarrow 2$ UQCM QI-OPA device or other $1 \rightarrow 2$ U-cloning schemes [5,20]. Let us return to the $1 \rightarrow 3$ PQCM. In the present scheme the input qubit, to be injected into a QI-OPA over the spatial mode k_1 with wavelength (wl) λ , is encoded into the polarization ($\vec{\pi}$) state $|\phi\rangle_{in} = \alpha |H\rangle + \beta |V\rangle$ of a single photon, where $|H\rangle$ and $|V\rangle$ stand for horizontal and vertical polarization: Figure 1. The QI-OPA consisted of a nonlinear (NL) BBO (β -barium-borate), cut for Type II phase matching and excited by a sequence of UV mode-locked laser pulses having wl. λ_p . The relevant modes of the NL 3-wave interaction driven by the UV pulses associated with mode k_p were the two spatial modes with wave-vector (wv) k_i , $i = 1, 2$, each one supporting the two horizontal and vertical polarizations of the interacting photons. The QI-OPA was λ -degenerate, i.e. the interacting photons had the same wl's $\lambda = 2\lambda_p = 795nm$. The NL crystal orientation was set as to realize the insensitivity of the amplification quantum efficiency to any input state $|\phi\rangle_{in}$ i.e. the *universality* (U) of the "cloning machine" and of the U-NOT gate [5]. This key property is assured by the squeezing hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{int} = i\chi\hbar (\hat{a}_{1\phi}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\phi^\perp}^\dagger - \hat{a}_{1\phi^\perp}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\phi}^\dagger) + h.c.$ where the field

operator $\hat{a}_{ij}^\dagger$ refers to the state of polarization j ($j = \phi, \phi^\perp$), realized on the two interacting spatial modes k_i ($i = 1, 2$).

Let us consider the injected photon in the mode k_1 to have any linear polarization $\vec{\pi} = \phi$. We express this $\vec{\pi}$ -state as $\hat{a}_{1\phi}^\dagger |0, 0\rangle_{k_1} = |1, 0\rangle_{k_1}$ where $|m, n\rangle_{k_1}$ represents a product state with m photons of the mode k_1 with polarization ϕ , and n photons with polarization $\phi^\perp$. Assume the input mode k_2 to be in the *vacuum state* $|0, 0\rangle_{k_2}$. The initial $\vec{\pi}$ -state of modes k_i reads $|\phi\rangle_{in} = |1, 0\rangle_{k_1} |0, 0\rangle_{k_2}$ and evolves according to the unitary operator $\hat{U} \equiv \exp\left(-i\frac{\hat{H}_{int}t}{\hbar}\right)$. The 1st-order contribution of the output state of the *QIOPA* is $\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|2, 0\rangle_{k_1}|0, 1\rangle_{k_2} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}|1, 1\rangle_{k_1}|1, 0\rangle_{k_2}$. The above linearization procedure is justified here by the small experimental value of the *gain* $g \equiv \chi t \approx 0.1$. In this context, the state $|2, 0\rangle_{k_1}$, expressing two photons of the ϕ mode k_1 in the $\vec{\pi}$ -state ϕ , corresponds to the state $|\phi\phi\rangle$ expressed by the general theory and implies the $L = 2$ cloning of the input $N = 1$ qubit. Contextually with the realization of cloning on mode k_1 , the vector $|0, 1\rangle_{k_2}$ expresses the single photon state on mode k_2 with polarization $\phi^\perp$, i.e. the *flipped* version of the input qubit. In summary, the qubits S and A are realized by two single photons propagating along mode k_1 while the qubit B corresponds to the $\vec{\pi}$ -state of the photon on mode k_2 .

The $U_B = \sigma_Y$ flipping operation on the output mode k_2 , implemented by means of two $\lambda/2$ waveplates, transformed the QI-OPA output state into: $|\Upsilon\rangle_{SAB} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|2, 0\rangle_{k_1}|1, 0\rangle_{k_2} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}|1, 1\rangle_{k_1}|0, 1\rangle_{k_2}$. The physical implementation of the projector Π_{sym}^{SAB} on the three photons $\vec{\pi}$ -states was carried out by linearly superimposing the modes k_1 and k_2 on the 50 : 50 beam-splitter BS_A and then by selecting the case in which the 3 photons emerged from BS_A on the same output mode k_3 (or, alternatively on k_4) [9]. The BS_A input-output mode relations are expressed by the field operators: $\hat{a}_{1j}^\dagger = 2^{-1/2}(\hat{a}_{3j}^\dagger + i\hat{a}_{4j}^\dagger)$; $\hat{a}_{2j}^\dagger = 2^{-1/2}(i\hat{a}_{3j}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{4j}^\dagger)$ where the operator $\hat{a}_{ij}^\dagger$ refers to the mode k_i with polarization j . The input state of BS_A can be re-written in the following form $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\left(\hat{a}_{1\phi}^{\dagger 2}\hat{a}_{2\phi}^\dagger - \hat{a}_{1\phi}^\dagger\hat{a}_{1\phi^\perp}^\dagger\hat{a}_{2\phi^\perp}^\dagger\right)|0, 0\rangle_{k_1}|0, 0\rangle_{k_2}$. By adopting the previous relations and by considering the case in which 3 photons emerge over the mode k_3 , the output state is found to be $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_{3\phi}^{\dagger 3} + \hat{a}_{3\phi}^\dagger\hat{a}_{3\phi^\perp}^{\dagger 2})|0, 0\rangle_{k_3} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}|3, 0\rangle_{k_3} + \frac{1}{2}|1, 2\rangle_{k_3}$. The

output fidelity is $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow 3} = \frac{5}{6}$.

Interestingly, the same overall state evolution can also be obtained, with no need of the final BS_A symmetrization, at the output of a QI-OPA with a type II crystal working in a *collinear* configuration, as proposed by [21]. In this case the interaction Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{coll} = i\chi\hbar \left(\hat{a}_H^\dagger \hat{a}_V^\dagger \right) + h.c.$ acts on a single spatial mode k . A fundamental physical property of $\hat{H}_{coll}$ consists of its rotational invariance under $U(1)$ transformations, that is, under any arbitrary rotation around the z -axis. Indeed $\hat{H}_{coll}$ can be re-expressed as $\frac{1}{2}i\chi\hbar e^{-i\psi} \left(\hat{a}_\psi^{\dagger 2} - e^{i2\psi} \hat{a}_{\psi\perp}^{\dagger 2} \right) + h.c.$ for $\psi \in (0, 2\pi)$ where $\hat{a}_\psi^\dagger = 2^{-1/2}(\hat{a}_H^\dagger + e^{i\psi}\hat{a}_V^\dagger)$ and $\hat{a}_{\psi\perp}^\dagger = 2^{-1/2}(-e^{-i\psi}\hat{a}_H^\dagger + \hat{a}_V^\dagger)$. Let us consider an injected single photon with $\vec{\pi}$ -state $|\psi\rangle_{in} = 2^{-1/2}(|H\rangle + e^{i\psi}|V\rangle) = |1, 0\rangle_k$. The first contribution to the amplified state, $\sqrt{6}|3, 0\rangle_k - \sqrt{2}e^{i2\psi}|1, 2\rangle_k$ is identical to the output state obtained with the device dealt with in the present work up to a phase factor which does not affect the fidelity value.

The UV pump beam with wvl λ_p , back reflected by the spherical mirror M_p with 100% reflectivity and μ -adjustable position $\mathbf{Z}$, excited the NL crystal in both directions $-k_p$ and k_p , i.e. correspondingly oriented towards the right hand side and the left hand side of Fig.1. A Spontaneous Parametric Down Conversion (SPDC) process excited by the $-k_p$ UV mode created *singlet-states* of photon polarization ($\vec{\pi}$). The photon of each SPDC pair emitted over the mode $-k_1$ was back-reflected by a spherical mirror M into the NL crystal and provided the $N = 1$ *quantum injection* into the OPA excited by the UV beam associated with the back-reflected mode k_p . The twin SPDC photon emitted over mode $-k_2$, selected by the "state analyzer" consisting of the combination (Wave-Plate + Polarizing Beam Splitter: $WP_T + PBS_T$) and detected by D_T , provided the "trigger" of the overall conditional experiment. Because of the EPR non-locality of the emitted singlet, the $\vec{\pi}$ -selection made on $-k_2$ implied deterministically the selection of the input state $|\phi\rangle_{in}$ on the injection mode k_1 . By adopting a $\lambda/2$ wave-plate (WP_T) with different orientations of the optical axis, the following $|\phi\rangle_{in}$ states were injected: $|H\rangle$ and $2^{-1/2}(|H\rangle + |V\rangle) = |+\rangle$. A more detailed description of the QI-OPA setup can be found in [5]. The $U_B = \sigma_Y$ flipping operation was implemented by two $\lambda/2$ waveplates (wp), as said. The device BS_A was positioned onto

a motorized translational stage: the position $X = 0$ in Fig. 2 was conventionally assumed to correspond to the best overlap between the interacting photon wavepackets which propagate along k_1 and k_2 .

The output state on mode k_3 was analyzed by the setup shown in the inset of Fig. 1: the field on mode k_4 was disregarded, for simplicity. The polarization state on mode k_3 was analyzed by the combination of the $\lambda/2$ wp WP_C and of the polarizer beam splitter PBS_C . For each input $\vec{\pi}$ -state $|\phi\rangle_S$, two different measurements were performed. In a first experiment WP_C was set in order to make PBS_C to transmit $|\phi\rangle$ and reflect $|\phi^\perp\rangle$. The cloned state $|\phi\phi\phi\rangle$ was detected by a coincidence between the detectors $[D_C^1, D_C^2, D_C^3]$ while the state $|\phi\phi\phi^\perp\rangle$, in the ideal case not present, was detected by a coincidence recorded either by the D set $[D_C^1, D_C^2, D_C^*]$, or by $[D_C^1, D_C^3, D_C^*]$, or by $[D_C^2, D_C^3, D_C^*]$. In order to detect the contribution due to $|\phi\phi^\perp\phi^\perp\rangle$, WP_C was rotated in order to make PBS_C to transmit $|\phi^\perp\rangle$ and reflect $|\phi\rangle$ and by recording the coincidences by one of the sets $[D_C^1, D_C^2, D_C^*]$, $[D_C^1, D_C^3, D_C^*]$, $[D_C^2, D_C^3, D_C^*]$. The different overall quantum efficiencies have been taken into account in the processing of the experimental data. The precise sequence of the experimental procedures was suggested by the following considerations. Assume the cloning machine turned off, by setting the optical delay $|Z| \gg c\tau_{coh}$, i.e., by spoiling the temporal overlap between the injected photon and the UV pump pulse. In this case since the states $|\phi\phi\rangle$ and $|\phi^\perp\phi^\perp\rangle$ are emitted with same probability by the machine, the rate of coincidences due to $|\phi\phi\phi\rangle$ and $|\phi\phi^\perp\phi^\perp\rangle$ were expected to be equal. By turning on the PQCM, i.e., by setting $|Z| \ll c\tau_{coh}$, the output state (2) was realized showing a factor $R = 3$ enhancement of the counting rate of $|\phi\phi\phi\rangle$ and *no* enhancement of $|\phi\phi^\perp\phi^\perp\rangle$. In Fig.2 the coincidences data for the different state components are reported versus the delay Z for the two input qubits $|\phi\rangle_{in}$. We may check that the phase covariant cloning process affects only the $|\phi\phi\phi\rangle$ component, as expected. Let us label by the symbol h the output state components as follows: $\{h = 1 \leftrightarrow |\phi\phi^\perp\phi^\perp\rangle, 2 \leftrightarrow |\phi\phi\phi^\perp\rangle, 3 \leftrightarrow |\phi\phi\phi\rangle\}$. For each index h , b_h is the average coincidence rate when the cloning machine is turned off, i.e. $|Z| \gg c\tau_{coh}$. while the signal-to-noise (S/N) parameter R_h is the ratio between the peak values of the coincidence

rates detected respectively for $Z \simeq 0$ and $|Z| \gg c\tau_{coh}$. The optimal values obtained by the above analysis are: $R_3 = 3$, $R_1 = 1$, $b_3 = b_1$ and $b_2 = 0$, $R_2 = 0$. These last values, $h = 2$ are considered since they are actually measured in the experiment: Fig.2. The fidelity has been evaluated by means of the expression $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow 3}(\phi) = (3b_3R_3 + 2b_2R_2 + b_1R_1) \times (3b_3R_3 + 3b_2R_2 + 3b_1R_1)^{-1}$ and by the experimental values of b_h , R_h . For $|\phi\rangle_{in} = |H\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle_{in} = |+\rangle$ we have found respectively $R_3 = 2.00 \pm 0.12$ and $R_3 = 1.92 \pm 0.06$ (see Fig.2). We have obtained $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow 3}(|+\rangle) = 0.76 \pm 0.01$, and $\mathcal{F}_{cov}^{1 \rightarrow 3}(|H\rangle) = 0.80 \pm 0.01$, to be compared with the theoretical value 0.83. The fidelity of the cloning $|H\rangle$ is slightly increased by a contribution 0.02 due to an unbalancement of the Hamiltonian terms.

For the sake of completeness, we have carried out an experiment setting the pump mirror in the position $Z \simeq 0$ and changing the position X of BS_A . The injected state was $|\phi\rangle_{in} = |+\rangle$. Due to quantum interference, the coincidence rate was enhanced by a factor V^* moving from the position $|X| \gg c\tau_{coh}$ to the condition $X \approx 0$. The $|\phi\phi^\perp\phi^\perp\rangle$ enhancement was found $V_{exp}^* = 1.70 \pm 0.10$, to be compared with the theoretical value $V^* = 2$ while the enhancement of the term $|\phi\phi\phi\rangle$ was found $V_{exp}^* = 2.16 \pm 0.12$, to be compared with the theoretical value $V^* = 3$. These results, not reported in Fig. 2, are a further demonstration of the 3-photon interference in the Hong-Ou-Mandel device.

In conclusion, we have implemented the optimal quantum triplicators for equatorial qubits. The present approach can be extended in a straightforward way to the case of $1 \rightarrow M$ PQCM for M odd. The results are relevant in the modern science of quantum communication as the PQCM is deeply connected to the optimal eavesdropping attack at *BB84* protocol, which exploits the transmission of quantum states belonging to the $x - z$ plane of the Bloch sphere. [22,11]. The optimal fidelities achievable for equatorial qubits are equal to the ones considered for the four states adopted in *BB84* [13]. In addition, the phase covariant cloning can be useful to optimally perform different quantum computation tasks adopting qubits belonging to the equatorial subspace [23].

This work has been supported by the FET European Network on Quantum Information and Communication (Contract IST-2000-29681: ATESIT), by Istituto Nazionale per

la Fisica della Materia (PRA "CLON") and by Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (COFIN 2002).

REFERENCES

- [1] W.K. Wootters, and W.H. Zurek, Nature (London) **299**, 802 (1982), G.Ghirardi, Referee Report for Found. of Physics (1981).
- [2] H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4238 (1999); V. Secondi, F. Sciarrino, and F. De Martini, Phys. Rev A (in press).
- [3] V. Bužek, and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1844 (1996); N. Gisin, and S. Massar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2153 (1997); R. Derka, V. Buzek and A. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1571 (1998).
- [4] F. De Martini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2842 (1998).
- [5] F. De Martini, V. Bužek, F. Sciarrino, and C. Sias, Nature (London) **419**, 815 (2002); D. Pelliccia, et al., Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042306 (2003); F. De Martini, D. Pelliccia, and F. Sciarrino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 067901 (2004).
- [6] A. Lamas-Linares, C. Simon, J.C. Howell, and D. Bouwmeester, Science **296**, 712 (2002).
- [7] S. Fasel, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 107901 (2002).
- [8] H.K. Cummins *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 187901 (2002).
- [9] M. Ricci, F. Sciarrino, C. Sias, and F. De Martini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 047901 (2004); F. Sciarrino, C. Sias, M. Ricci, and F. De Martini, Phys. Lett. A. **323**, 34 (2004); F. Sciarrino, C. Sias, M. Ricci, and F. De Martini, Phys. Rev A **70**, 052305 (2004).
- [10] W.T.M. Irvine, A. Lamas Linares, M.J.A. de Dood, and D. Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 047902 (2004).
- [11] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel., H. Zbinden, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 145 (2002).
- [12] D. Bruss, M. Cincetti, G.M. D'Ariano, and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 012302 (2000); G.M. D'Ariano, and P. Lo Presti, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042308 (2001); H. Fan, K. Matsumoto, X. Wang, and M. Wadati, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012304 (2001).

- [13] D. Bruss and C. Macchiavello, J. Phys. A **34**, 6815 (2001); G.M. D'Ariano, and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 042306 (2003).
- [14] D. Bruss, A. Ekert, and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2598 (1998).
- [15] S. Massar and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 1259 (1995).
- [16] A.S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982), p.163.
- [17] R. Derka, V. Buzek, and A.E. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1571 (1998).
- [18] J. Du, *et al.*, quant-ph/0311010 reports the experimental realization of the $1 \rightarrow 2$ PQCM by a NMR scheme.
- [19] J. Fiurasek, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 052314 (2003) has proposed a $1 \rightarrow 2$ PQCM based on an unbalanced beam-splitter with probability of success $p = 1/3$.
- [20] M. Ricci *et al* (to be published): recently a similar proposal has been implemented successfully by the full symmetrization methods reported by [9].
- [21] F. De Martini, Phys. Lett. A **250**, 15 (1998).
- [22] C.A. Fuchs, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 1163 (1997); N.J. Cerf, M. Bourennane A. Karlson, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 127902 (2002).
- [23] E.F. Galvão and L. Hardy, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022301 (2000).

Figure Captions

Figure.1. Schematic diagram of phase-covariant cloner, PQCM made up by a QI-OPA and a Hong-Ou-Mandel interferometer BS_A . INSET: measurement setup used for testing the cloning process.

Figure.2. Experimental results of the PQCM for the input qubits $|H\rangle$ and $|+\rangle = 2^{-1/2}(|H\rangle +$

$|V\rangle$). The measurement time of each 4-coincidence experimental datum was ~ 13000 s. The different overall detection efficiencies have been taken into account. The solid line represents the best Gaussian fit.



